Artificial Intelligence Review Committee (AIRC)

Analytic/Non-Human Subjects - Streamlined Rubric

Version: 2.0 (December 2025)

Use this rubric for: Routine de-identified data analytics, anonymous surveys, or standard "not human subjects research" projects using validated AI tools.

**Administrative Information**

| **Field** | **Information** |
| --- | --- |
| Protocol Number | [blank line] |
| Principal Investigator | [blank line] |
| Project Title | [blank line] |
| Date of Review | [blank line] |
| AIRC Reviewer(s) | [blank line] |
| AI Tool/Model Name and Version | [blank line] |
| Data Source(s) | [blank line] |
| Project Type | ☐ De-identified Data ☐ Anonymous Survey  ☐ Other |

**Instructions for Reviewers**

* Rate each domain on a 1-4 scale
* Use N/A if item does not apply (provide justification)
* Select "Insufficient Documentation" if unable to score
* Critical Rule: Score of 1 in any domain = "Not Acceptable"

**Domain 1: Data Quality & Privacy**

Purpose: Ensure data are appropriate, de-identified, and privacy is protected.

Scoring Criteria

| **Score** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| 4 - Exemplary | Complete data provenance, formal quality assessment, rigorous de-identification with expert determination, comprehensive re-identification risk analysis, enterprise-grade security |
| 3 - Proficient | Data sources clearly identified, quality appropriate for analysis, formal de-identification process, re-identification risk considered, security meeting institutional standards |
| 2 - Basic | Data sources identified with limited detail, quality acceptable but not validated, basic de-identification, limited risk assessment, basic security |
| 1 - Deficient | Sources unclear, poor data quality, de-identification questionable, no risk assessment, inadequate security |

Reviewer Assessment

| **Item** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Domain 1 Score (1-4) | [blank] | [blank area for comments] |
| ☐ N/A - Justification: |  |  |
| ☐ Insufficient Documentation |  |  |

**Domain 2: Analytic Validity**

Purpose: Ensure AI/analytic methods are scientifically sound.

Scoring Criteria

| **Score** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| 4 - Exemplary | AI approach optimally suited with detailed justification, performance metrics exceed standards with external validation, robust validation including cross-validation, statistical methods thoroughly documented, comprehensive limitations discussion |
| 3 - Proficient | AI approach appropriate and justified, performance metrics adequate, validation procedures documented, statistical methods clear, key limitations acknowledged |
| 2 - Basic | AI approach acceptable but limited justification, basic performance metrics, minimal validation, statistical methods vaguely described, limited limitations |
| 1 - Deficient | AI approach unsuitable, missing or inadequate metrics, no validation, statistical methods unclear, no limitations discussion |

Reviewer Assessment

| **Item** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Domain 2 Score (1-4) | [blank] | [blank area for comments] |
| ☐ N/A - Justification: |  |  |
| ☐ Insufficient Documentation |  |  |

**Domain 3: Transparency & Reproducibility**

Purpose: Ensure methods are transparent and results can be reproduced.

Scoring Criteria

| **Score** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| 4 - Exemplary | Algorithm fully specified with public repository, comprehensive methods enabling exact replication, code publicly available, formal version control with change logs, all analysis decisions documented |
| 3 - Proficient | Algorithm and version documented with rationale, methods sufficiently detailed for replication, code availability plan specified, version tracking in place, major decisions documented |
| 2 - Basic | Algorithm identified with limited detail, methods description incomplete, vague code availability, minimal version control, limited decision documentation |
| 1 - Deficient | Algorithm unclear, methods inadequate for replication, no code availability, no version control, analysis decisions undocumented |

Reviewer Assessment

| **Item** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Domain 3 Score (1-4) | [blank] | [blank area for comments] |
| ☐ N/A - Justification: |  |  |
| ☐ Insufficient Documentation |  |  |

**Domain 4: Group Harms & Responsible Use**

Purpose: Assess potential for group-level harms or societal impacts.

Scoring Criteria

| **Score** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| 4 - Exemplary | Detailed analysis of potential group-level impacts across multiple dimensions, thorough bias and discrimination assessment, proactive mitigation with monitoring, careful consideration of use/misuse scenarios, responsible dissemination with safeguards |
| 3 - Proficient | Major group harms identified and assessed, bias considerations documented, mitigation strategies in place, use/misuse scenarios considered, appropriate dissemination plan |
| 2 - Basic | Some group risks mentioned, minimal bias consideration, vague mitigation, limited use/misuse consideration, basic dissemination plan |
| 1 - Deficient | No consideration of group impacts, no bias assessment, no mitigation plans, no use/misuse consideration, inappropriate dissemination plan |

Reviewer Assessment

| **Item** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Domain 4 Score (1-4) | [blank] | [blank area for comments] |
| ☐ N/A - Justification: |  |  |
| ☐ Insufficient Documentation |  |  |

**Final Score Calculation and Recommendation**

**Score Summary**

| **Domain** | **Score (1-4)** |
| --- | --- |
| Domain 1: Data Quality & Privacy | [blank] |
| Domain 2: Analytic Validity | [blank] |
| Domain 3: Transparency & Reproducibility | [blank] |
| Domain 4: Group Harms & Responsible Use | [blank] |
| Total Score (Range: 4-16) | [blank] |

**Critical Deficiency Rule**

| **Check if applicable** |  |
| --- | --- |
| ☐ One or more domains scored 1 | *(If checked, Final Recommendation MUST be "NOT ACCEPTABLE")* |

**Final Recommendation**

Select One:

☐ ACCEPTABLE - Forward with approval recommendation

☐ MODIFICATIONS REQUIRED - Return to submitter with feedback below

☐ NOT ACCEPTABLE - Reject; major revision required

Required Modifications (if applicable):

[Large blank area]

**Overall Summary**

Strengths:

[Blank area]

Concerns:

[Blank area]

Additional Comments:

[Blank area]

Signatures

| **Role** | **Signature** | **Date** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewer | [blank line] | [blank line] |
| AIRC Chair/Designee | [blank line] | [blank line] |